

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/786,671	02/25/2004	Nelya Okun	50508-1190	3022
24504	7590 07/31	006	EXAMINER	
THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, LLP 100 GALLERIA PARKWAY, NW			FIORITO, JAMES	
STE 1750	ZKIATAKKWA1,1	•	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ATLANTA	, GA 30339-5948		1754	
			DATE MAILED: 07/31/200	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	_
	10/786,671	OKUN ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	James A. Fiorito	1754	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet w	th the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DOWN THE MAILING DOWN THE MAILING DOWN THE MAILING DOWN THE MAILING THE MAILING THE METERS OF THE MAILING THE MAILING THE METERS OF THE	ATE OF THIS COMMUNION 36(a). In no event, however, may a rewill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONON, cause the application to become Ab	CATION. eply be timely filed THS from the mailing date of this communication. EANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 F	ebruary 2003.		
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This	action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa	nce except for formal mat	ers, prosecution as to the merits is	
closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D). 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-29</u> is/are pending in the application			
4a) Of the above claim(s) 30-58 is/are withdraw	wn from consideration.		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-29</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.		
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acc			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex			
	Nammer. Note the attache	2 Chice Action of Ionn't 10 Tol.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:			
1. Certified copies of the priority document		unnitication No	
2. Certified copies of the priority document3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority			
application from the International Burea		Tooolvod III alia Hakaria. Otago	
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	•	received.	
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date	
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/10/2006. 		nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Application/Control Number: 10/786,671 Page 2

Art Unit: 1754

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1, 7-8, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1, 7-8 and 11 are drawn to the use of elements from the "d-block" and "f-block", the claims drawn toward an element from the "d-block" or "f-block" are indefinite, because it is unclear as to the exact elements that are included and not included in the "d-block" and "f-block".

Claims 9-12 and 18-19 are considered indefinite for the following reasons: 1) In each of claims 9-12, "a" is defined but not present in the recited formula; evidently, "a" should be replaced with "u". 2) In claim 9, "g", "j" and "i" are not defined; perhaps claim 9 should depend upon claim 8? 3) In claim 10 "g", "h" and "i" are not defined; perhaps claim 10 should depend upon claim 8? 4) In claim 12, "r", "s" and "y" are not defined; perhaps claim 12 should depend upon claim 11? 5) In claim 13, "r", "t" and "y" are not defined; perhaps claim 13 should depend upon claim 11? 6) In claim 18 (upon which claim 19 depends), "TBA₆Fe₃PW₉O₃₇" is recited twice.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Application/Control Number: 10/786,671

Art Unit: 1754

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-10, 14-19, 24 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) or 102(b) as being anticipated by Okun (Journal of Molecular Catalysis A, "Polyoxometalates on cationic silica Highly selective and efficient O₂/air-based oxidation of 2-chloroethyl ethyl sulfide at ambient temperature").

Okun teaches binary cupric nitrate and triflate (trifluoromethanesulfonate) systems that catalyze the homogeneous air oxidation of the mustard (HD) simulant 2-chloroethyl ethyl sulfide (CEES) (see abstract), thereby teaching compositions comprising copper (II) nitrate and copper (II) trifluoromethanesulfonate, per instant claims 1-5, and methods of removing contaminants using same, per instant claim 24. The systems of Okun further comprise polyoxometalates (POMs), per instant claim 6, to enhance activity (see abstract), thus compositions comprising copper (II) nitrate, copper (II) trifluoromethanesulfonate and POMs, per instant claims 15-17, and methods of removing contaminants using same, per instant claim 27, are also taught. Specific POMs include materials of structural formulae within the scope of instant claims 7-10, 14 and 18 (see the POMs disclosed at beginning of section 2.1 on p. 284; TBA salts in Table 1 at p. 286), thus compositions falling within the scope of instant claims 7- 10, 14 and 18-19 are also taught. In summary, Okun anticipates instant claims 1-10, 14-19, 24

Art Unit: 1754

and 27, since compositions and methods meeting all required limitations thereof are clearly taught.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okun (Journal of Molecular Catalysis A, "Polyoxometalates on cationic silica Highly selective and efficient O₂/air-based oxidation of 2-chloroethyl ethyl sulfide at ambient temperature") in view of Emory University WO 99/53131.

Okun is relied upon as set forth above, anticipating instant claim 6. However, while POMs of structural formulae within the scope of instant claims 7-10, 14 and 18 are taught, POMs of structural formulae within the scope of instant claims 11-13 are not.

Emory teaches that POMs of structural formulae within the scope of instant claims 7-1 0, 14 and 18, as well as instant claims 11-13, are effective in removing contaminants, including sulfur-containing toxic gases (see p. 1, lines I 4- I 9; p. 4, lines 13-18; p. 5, lines 1-24; p. 8, line 4 - p. 10, line 27; p. 13, lines 17-32). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the instant invention, to supplemented and/or at least partially substituted therefor the POMs in the systems/compositions of Okun as effective in the removal of mustard (HD) (i.e., a sulfur-

Application/Control Number: 10/786,671 Page 5

Art Unit: 1754

containing toxic gas) with the POMs of Emory, because, as just discussed, Emory teaches that all such POMs are effective in the removal of sulfur-containing toxic gases.

Claims 20-23, 25-26, and 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okun (Journal of Molecular Catalysis A, "Polyoxometalates on cationic silica Highly selective and efficient O₂/air-based oxidation of 2-chloroethyl ethyl sulfide at ambient temperature") in view of Braue '434.

Okun is relied upon as set forth above, anticipating instant composition of claims 1 and 6 and corresponding method claims 24 and 27. However, Okun fails to teach including the disclosed systems/compositions in a material, per instant claims 20, 21, 25 and 28, thereby failing to teach any of the specific materials of instant claims 22, 23, 26 and 29.

Braue teaches active topical skin protectants using POMs, specifically topical skin protectant formulations containing a barrier cream and an active moiety for protecting against chemical warfare agents (CWA's), the active moiety being the POMs (see abstract; Table 1 in col. 3). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the instant invention, to manufacture the systems/compositions of Okun as topical skin protectant formulations containing a barrier cream (i.e., "a topical carrier", one of the materials specifically recited in instant claims 22, 23, 26 and 29, because, as just discussed, Braue teaches that such formulations are an effective means for providing protection against CWA's--the same purpose as the systems/compositions of Okun (mustard (HD) being a CWA).

Conclusion

Art Unit: 1754

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Emory University WO 03/094977 teaches materials for degrading contaminants.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James A. Fiorito whose telephone number is (571)272-7426. The examiner can normally be reached on 9am - 6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stanley Silverman can be reached on (571) 272-1358. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 57/1-272-1000.

James Fiorito Patent Examiner AU 1754 Steven)Bos

Primary Patent Examiner

Page 6

AU 1754